

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for reviewing and considering the pending application. The *Office Action* dated August 28, 2007 has been received and reviewed.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 22-26 and 30 are hereby amended. Claims 27 and 31-35 are hereby cancelled, as a result of the finality of the restriction. Claim 13 is also hereby cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-12, 14-26, and 28-30 are currently pending. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 22-25, 27, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In particular, the Office asserts that claim 1 recites “having at least two sides” and that the claims further recite “the side” without proper antecedent basis. Applicants have amended the claims to enhance the clarity thereof. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection.

Claims 1-21 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. DES. 427,053 (hereinafter *Nelson*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.


As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, “the reference must teach every element of the claim.” Applicants respectfully submit that *Nelson* does not teach every element recited in claims 1-21 and 23-25, and therefore cannot anticipate these claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a lock nut for a leg assembly of electric home appliances comprising, *inter alia*, “an inclination direction of a first supplementary member adjacent to the first side and an inclination direction of a second supplementary member adjacent to the second side are upward and downward alternately.” Independent claim 22 recites a lock nut for a leg assembly of electric home appliances comprising, *inter alia*, “an inclination direction of a first extension member adjacent to the first side is different than an inclination direction of a second

extension member adjacent to the second side.” *Nelson* fails to teach at least these features, as recited.

In contrast, *Nelson* discloses discs 5, which are flat. Moreover, each section of the discs 5 between element 8 are identical. See *Nelson* at Fig. 1, which is reproduced below with the Office’s annotations. See *Office Action* at page 5. In other words, the disc section 5 adjacent to side 4 is the same as the disc section 5 adjacent to side 4’. As such, *Nelson* fails to disclose an inclination direction of a first supplementary member adjacent to the first side and an inclination direction of a second supplementary member adjacent to the second side are upward and downward alternately. In addition, *Nelson* fails to disclose an inclination direction of a first extension member adjacent to the first side, which is different than an inclination direction of a second extension member adjacent to the second side, as required by independent claim 22.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 22 are allowable over *Nelson*. Claims 2-12, 14-21, and 23-25, which variously depend from either claim 1 or claim 22, are also allowable over *Nelson*.



Claims 22 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nelson* in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,868,079 (hereinafter *Johnson*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” Applicant respectfully submits that *Nelson* and *Johnson*, taken singularly or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature, as recited. Thus, the combined teaching cannot render these claims obvious.

For example, independent claim 22 recites a lock nut for a leg assembly of electric home appliances comprising, *inter alia*, “an inclination direction of a first extension member adjacent to the first side is different than an inclination direction of a second extension member adjacent to the second side.” As aforementioned, *Nelson* fails to disclose or suggest at least these features, as recited in claim 22.

Moreover, *Johnson* fails to address the shortcomings *Nelson*. Indeed, *Johnson* is only relied upon for its purported disclosure of “a threaded locking nut attached to a leg bolt of a home appliance, specifically a washing machine.” See *page 9 of the Office Action*. Further, even if one skilled in the art modified *Nelson* in view of *Johnson*, as suggested, the resulting modification would still fail to teach each and every feature of claims 22 and 26-30. Accordingly, claim 22 is allowable over *Nelson* and *Johnson*, singularly or in combination. Likewise, claims 26-30, which variously depend from claim 22, are also allowable over *Nelson* and *Johnson*, taken singularly or in combination. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection.

The application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: November 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By

Mark R. Kresloff

Registration No.: 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant

Attachments